

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, October 10, 2019 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, WI

Present: Chair Sieber, Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Kneiszel, Supervisor Deneys, Supervisor Vander Leest
Also Present: Supervisors Borchardt, Lefebvre, Tran and Brusky; Executive Streckenbach, Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt, Corporation Counsel David Hemery, Finance Director Bradley Klingsporn, Senior Accountant – Budget Coordinator David Diedrick, HR Generalist Ashley Morrow, Benefits Manager Jill Bomkamp, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Treasurer Paul Zeller, Child Support Director Maria Lasecki, Child Support Supervisor Natalie Poupore, County Clerk Sandy Juno, Technology Services Director August Neverman, and other interested parties.

I. Call to Order.

This meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Sieber at 5:00 pm.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of September 5, 2019.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public – None.

1. Review minutes of:

- a. Citizens Redistricting Advisory Subcommittee (September 30, 2019).

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- b. Housing Authority June 17 & August 19, 2019.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Communications – None.

County Clerk

2. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2019 (Unaudited).

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Technology Services

1. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2019 (Unaudited).

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

2. Discussion and possible action; plans for a box storage building – *standing item*.

Director of Technology Services August Neverman informed he is continuing to work with the administration and Facilities but he does not have anything new to report at this time. Sieber informed this item will remain as a standing item on future agendas.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Technology Services Monthly Report.

Neverman informed that Laura Workman is retiring after 37 years with the county. She is one of the senior managers and has done a huge amount of work for the county, including developing the prior financial system which likely saved the county millions of dollars. Sieber asked Neverman to pass on thanks and congratulations to her.

Neverman also informed that cyber security attacks continue to increase, but the county has not been compromised in any significant way to date. Attacks are becoming more and more sophisticated and he referenced a school district in the state that was hit very hard. He noted everyone is at risk for these attacks but the county's cyber security person is doing a really good job of keeping the county protected and he also pointed out that the county does have system backups.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Child Support

4. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2019 (Unaudited).

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Budget Adjustment Request (19-081): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.

Child Support Director Maria Lasecki reported this was a unique opportunity that the Bureau of Child Support presented for the Access and Visitation grant and services. They had additional money available that needed to be used by the end of the federal fiscal year. Lasecki wanted to use the opportunity to get certified mediators on board through staff and these funds allowed for seven staff members to go to Madison for a six day course and this was an opportunity she could not pass up.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Director Summary.

Lasecki said she plans to change the format of her Director's Summary moving forward to make it a little more visual and easier to differentiate between performance goals, where they were last year versus this year, and other information regarding her department.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Treasurer

7. Review of Budget Performance Report for August 2019 (Unaudited).

Treasurer Paul Zeller informed they are on track or better.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. **Treasurer's Report.**

Zeller said he brings many items to these meetings in the form of charts and spreadsheets and if the Committee does not wish to see all of these, they can let him know. The second thing Zeller brought up was the Investment Advisory Contract for the Port and Solid Waste portfolio. This is a separate portfolio of long-term funds that is not currently managed by the Treasurer. The contract for the management of this portfolio will be coming to an end on December 31. A meeting was held with Zeller, Dean Haen, David Diedrick and Bradley Klingsporn and it was concluded that as of January 1, 2020 Zeller will be taking over the management of that portfolio and this will save Port and Solid Waste in excess of \$26,000. It does not make sense to pay an advisor for services that Zeller can provide himself. This will mean that in 2020 the Treasurer will be managing all of the portfolios of all the county departments. In addition, Zeller also manages all the DNR long-term care funds and maintenance funds for the current landfills.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **Discussion and possible action re: Resolution Ordering the Cancellation of Tax Deed Regarding Parcel M-332-2, a/k/a 3531 Park Road, Town of Morrison (from September 2019 Administration Committee meeting).**

Zeller informed this came from the previous month's meeting. It is in regard to a parcel the county took during the most-recent foreclosure proceedings culminating April 1st. It was later discovered following a complete land survey by Brown County Planning that some type of improvement was being assessed by the Town's assessor, but this parcel did not have any improvements on it. A survey was provided in the agenda packet which shows the property lines and boundaries and the structure lies outside of those boundaries. In consulting with Corporation Counsel, it was determined that since an incorrect assessment was the basis for the foreclosure, the tax deed that was issued for failure to pay the property taxes is invalid. The county intends to cancel the invalid tax deed and return ownership to the former owner.

Corporation Counsel David Hemery added that the local municipality assesses the property and then lets the Treasurer know what number to put on the tax bill they send out. If taxes are not paid for a certain number of years, the in rem process is started. In this case the property was assessed as having an improvement on it, in this case, a house, however the house was really outside the property, but this was not known at that time. When taxes go without being paid, tax certificates are issued and if they are not paid the property goes into the in rem process. In this instance, there were four tax certificates that were issued and not paid so the property went to the in rem process and a deed was issued to the county, making the county the owner of the property.

Hemery continued that Wis. Stats. §75.22 says if the county acquires a deed to land through the in rem process based on improper or invalid tax certificates, the county may order the cancellation of the certificates and deed and that is what Hemery is asking be done in this case. Once the deed is cancelled, the property reverts back as though the county was never involved so the county does not have anything to do with questions of ownership or anything of that nature. Sieber said he was made aware that the previous owner of the property may be deceased and Hemery responded that the county would not get into that aspect of it all; that is something that the courts would determine through probate.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Paul Van Dreel, 433 School Street, Wrightstown, WI

Van Dreel asked if the county voids the tax certificates, the conveyance and the tax foreclosure deed if all of the penance goes back on the property.

Hemery advised that currently Van Dreel has litigation pending against Brown County with the next court date being on October 17 and he advised the Committee not to respond to any questions.

Van Dreel also asked how much the Treasurer is bonded for. Sieber said that would need to be taken up on a different agenda item.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to return to regular order of business.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Deneys said that even though the property was assessed incorrectly in that it did not have any improvements on it, there still should have been an assessment for the property and asked what happens to the taxes that should have been collected on the non-improved property. Hemery responded that the county cannot tax unless there is a correct assessment, so the municipality is going to have to determine what the property should have been taxed for and he believes the county could then attempt to collect taxes based on that amount. He continued that the county is not the assessor and this is more of a municipality issue. Right now there are four years of taxes that were issued and unpaid so there is no money for those years. Should the tax certificates be cancelled today, the county still will not have any money for those years. Hemery is not prepared at this time to talk about what a resolution for that would be; his main objective tonight is to get the county out of this situation. Deneys understands the municipality has to resolve their portion of this before the county can do anything further.

Sieber added that for all these in rem properties, the county pays the taxes out to the municipality, school district and technical college and they are saying it's a cost of doing business and those funds are not recouped. Zeller agreed and said the in rem process makes all taxing jurisdictions except Brown County whole.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **Discussion and possible action re: Sale of Brown County owned Parcel 21-1293-2 at 1739 Main Street, Green Bay, Wi – Formal Offers to Purchase will be received and evaluated by Committee members as directed by Administration Committee Summer 2019.**

Zeller informed he spoke to the adjoining property owners, one of whom expressed interest and asked for the path to obtain the property. They did contact him and asked him procedurally what the next steps should be and Zeller recommended that any type of offer be submitted to this Committee on an official offer to purchase form. They did submit an offer to purchase in writing and Zeller instructed them it should be a sealed offer and the deputy treasurer would receive that and keep it locked in the safe until this afternoon. Zeller took the offer out of the safe this afternoon and made copies for the committee which he distributed. The offer is \$39,000 and Zeller recalled that he has added up the county's costs with regard to this property from the date of foreclosure judgment to now and it is just under \$39,000 at \$38,618.19 as of August 29. Zeller said the offer makes the county whole and that is ultimately what the county is looking for and he recommends accepting this non-contingent offer and asked that a date for closing be set prior to the end of the year.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to accept the non-contingent offer of \$39,000 for Parcel 21-1293-2 at 1739 Main St. from Juan Maldonado with a closing date prior to December 31st.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. **Discussion and possible action on the sale of the following Brown County owned tax deed parcels located in the City of Green Bay to the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay**

<u>Parcel#</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Municipal Sale Amount \$</u>
1-936-B	1321 S. Broadway Street	\$5,801.91 + \$30 + conditions
1-950	827 Ninth Street	\$3,861.83 + \$30 + conditions
17-880	445 S. Baird Street	\$5,262.84 + \$30 + conditions
21-455-2	2221 Manitowoc Road	\$16,635.43 + \$30 + conditions
*3-40	852 Shawano Avenue	\$4,839.65 + \$30 + conditions

Zeller would like to take these parcel by parcel and noted that Corporation Counsel has been very helpful to him in the process of selling these in rem properties back to municipalities. The statutory direction is if there has been special assessments put on the tax bill for any of the years that have been foreclosed on, the municipality has the ability to purchase the parcels from the county at the statutorily determined municipal sale amount. The caveat is that the county can step in and pay the special assessments and retain their interest and privilege to sell the property to recoup taxes, interest and penalties as well as the special assessments. The Redevelopment Authority (RDA) has a desire to purchase some, but not all of the properties as they are not part of their targeted neighborhoods or redevelopment plan.

Zeller considers the amount of special assessments when he looks at these and if it is raze cost, it does not make sense for the county to pay that raze cost on a property that they cannot sell for \$5,000. If it makes sense for the county, Zeller contacts the city to see what their level of interest is. The RDA meets November 12 and will take up the properties based on what is decided tonight. The guiding principal of the RDA is to develop the property and get it back on the tax rolls. Many of these are vacant lots that they have some long-term plan for or are sold to Habitat for Humanity or they have some other plan for them. If the county keeps the properties, the county then has to sell the parcels and if they would sell for more than what is due to the county, the excess portion of the proceeds would go to pay for the special assessments in the order of payments.

Zeller asked if the Committee was interested in selling the parcels as a package which could then go to the November 12 RDA meeting. This is complicated when so many of the parcels are City of Green Bay parcels. Zeller said he can go through the parcels one at a time to let the Committee know what the special assessments are and why it does not make sense for the county to keep them.

Zeller's opinion is that it would be in the county's best interest to sell all five of these parcels to the RDA. Sieber noted that the statutes are pretty clear as to what the sale price to a municipality would be and we cannot add conditions. Hemery agreed. Zeller said the conditions being that Brown County does not pay the special assessments, any delinquent water and sewer bills and that the city is responsible for the 2019 property taxes which are imposed on the parcels and the city has agreed to those conditions. Hemery added that the Treasurer can decide at any time to pay the specials on these and then the county can sell them and try to make a profit. The RDA has agreed to be cordial and not stick the county with water bills and things like that and the county agrees not to do the special assessments. It is more of an agreement in general as to how to handle the process between the city and the county. These are mutually agreed upon terms; not imposed conditions.

Supervisor Kneiszel asked about parcel *3-40 that the RDA does not want. Zeller responded that that is one of the three eviction parcels they carried out last month. It is a home on Shawano Avenue that is in the flood plain and there is at least three inches of water in the basement. The third party appraisal on the property has concluded a value of \$2,000. Zeller continued that the RDA is attempting to improve that neighborhood, but they do not want the property because of the deficiencies and he feels the property should probably be torn down. Zeller already has this parcel scheduled for sale on the auction, but noted that the county has the right to remove any parcel from the auction prior to the conclusion of the auction. Zeller would like to ask the RDA to take the parcel and have the Committee's approval on a purchase price to the city so they can act on it at their November 12 meeting.

Zeller continued that he can offer all of the parcels at the figures above to the RDA so they can act on them. If the Committee is in agreement, he would like to see all parcels be sold to the RDA. The RDA would be able to decide which of the parcels they wish to purchase.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to give authority to the Treasurer to seek the sale of 1-936-B for \$5,801.91 + \$30 + conditions, 1-950 for \$3,861.83 + \$30 + conditions, 17-880 for \$5,262.84 + \$30 + conditions, 21-455-2 for \$16,635.43 + \$30 + conditions and 3-40 for \$4,839.65 + \$30 + conditions. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Department of Administration & Human Resources

12. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2019 (Unaudited).

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. Budget Adjustment Log.

Weininger informed that they are now doing contracts with budget adjustments when applicable and there is one included to provide 911 services to the Oneida Nation.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deney's to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. Budget Adjustment Request (20-001) – Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.

This budget adjustment is for a contract change approval for Stop Loss provider. Contract would be awarded to H.C.C. Life Insurance Company and the county is estimating to save \$612,918 in premiums. There will be no offsetting decrease in revenues.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Courthouse Security Funding.

Weininger stated this is something they need to figure out and if they want to scope it or do they want to look at alternatives or cheaper options and how it is going to be funded. Weininger said there are a number of other projects that need to be considered such as the juvenile justice facility, the 911 tower, and the 911 system as well as energy upgrades of \$1 to \$3 million dollars. If energy upgrades were done, it would result in quite a large operating levy. Weininger said it is getting to the point where things are getting a little tight and we are at the point where we have to have start prioritizing. This is more of a general discussion and if the Committee directs him to move forward, he will come back with options.

Sieber said in the past there were some large projects that were approved without vetting them through the committees. He said some of these projects he is first hearing about tonight and he does not feel comfortable voting on them without more research. Weininger said that is why there is a five year CIP. Staff does a good job of estimating and then from the estimate they get the quotes and then they work with them to scale to see what is desired to put into the budget. With regard to the 911 tower, Weininger said if something happens, there would be no choice but to come up with the funds. He said what he is looking for is the priority of these projects in the five year plan and to start looking for other options where appropriate.

With regard to the courthouse security Weininger can request more detailed information. Weininger is not asking for any action on this tonight; he is trying to get a gauge of the Committee's thoughts on the project. Deneys said the courthouse security issue has been ongoing but the \$2 million dollar price tag was a shock to everyone, but a lot of that was due to the historical aspect. His opinion is that the price tag does not change the need. He feels there is enough support from the Supervisors he has talked to that there should probably be some type of plan to fund this going forward. Weininger said he did put that in the CIP but he did not allocate a dollar amount to a specific year. Vander Leest added that if courthouse security is on the five year plan, we should start to think about the priority of it. He feels there needs to be a funding source before we can commit to the project. Schadewald also mentioned the five year plan and said that there is a huge difference between planning for the future and what actually happens in the future. He agreed with Sieber in that we should have more information and planning sheets and summations of each of the projects in the plan. Weininger said that changes need to be made to the plan from time to time based on different circumstances. The current process is to do the five year CIP plan that outlines the things we know are going to need to be done over the next several years. He has also started putting in things that some of the department heads are talking about. When the CIP is approved, they put everything in the next year in the budget and then it is more of a reality.

Weininger is saying that courthouse security is not currently in the budget, but it is in the CIP. If it is a huge priority, he needs to know where to start fitting it in. Schadewald said there needs to be something set forth somewhere that the Committees and administration are aware of that talks more about the planning and where the funds for these things are going to come from.

Sieber said we have talked about courthouse security before, but there are other projects as well that also cost millions of dollars and we need to have more information before the budget on what the stuff is and what the potential funding sources are. Weininger responded that he just wanted to be sure the Committee knows the courthouse security is not included in the 2020 budget and, further that he has been talking about little things as they come up, but he has never talked about the projects in total and he just wants the Committee to be aware of things that may be coming up. He will make an effort to document things a little more in the future.

Supervisor Brusky wanted to know what would have to happen to get the courthouse security project in the 2020 budget as she feels it is a high priority project. Weininger responded that the jai project could be stopped or scaled back or the ME project could be eliminated. Weininger said his intent was to use some of the funds from the Securis lawsuit for this to fund the estimate that was originally given to him. When the project came in at \$2 million dollars,

it made it much more difficult to find dollars. He also noted that there will be a budget adjustment coming before the Board for the southern bridge that will be about \$600,000. At this time we would likely have to say we are not going to build the ME office or the Jail because he does not feel either of those projects could be scaled back. Another option would be to take the funds from the general fund, but Weininger strongly opposes that. Weininger also suggested looking at ways to scale the courthouse security project back which would make finding funding easier. Hemery also noted that consideration will also need to be given to the historical nature of the building. Brusky feels as soon as we can get this project done, we should do it. Weininger feels it would be realistic to put this in the 2021 CIP if we drill down the project a little bit.

Vander Leest said that working this into the system in 2021 would be good. Schadewald also mentioned the cost of staffing and said that needs to be considered. Weininger said the Sheriff is thinking staffing may be in the area of \$60,000 but they would go through those numbers to hone them in a little.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. Director's Reports.

Weininger informed that the county has always been in support of community development through their TIDs. The City of Green Bay recently had a downgrade of their bond rating in July. One of the major issues was that reserve levels remain below average for the rating category so technically they already have an issue and then exposure to tax increment districts present some very interesting credit challenges and then high fixed costs due to elevated debt burden because of tax increment districts. Weininger said the county's Finance Manager voted against one of the TIDs, but that is not typically something the county does. He feels for a while the city was doing a very good job of closing TIDs down and then investing in pay as you go so if there is an increment created, they would give money for the increment created but they are now diverting from that. This means there are less property taxes that affect De Pere, Pulaski and Howard. Weininger said he generally does not like to talk about this publicly, but there may be some issues with this coming up. He noted he has gone through almost all the municipalities and read all their development agreements and most of them have been fairly good. Things may come up in the future where Weininger is talking about poor performing TIDs and he wanted to give the Committee a heads up on this.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

17. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to acknowledge receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

22. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Siebert noted the Treasurer needs a meeting scheduled early in November and it was suggested that it be held prior to the budget meeting on November 6 at 8:30 am. County Board staff will set this up.

23. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to adjourn at 8:17 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Administrative Coordinator

Therese Giannunzio
Transcriptionist

WB-11 RESIDENTIAL OFFER TO PURCHASE

1 LICENSEE DRAFTING THIS OFFER ON September 11th 2019 [DATE] IS (AGENT OF BUYER)
2 (~~AGENT OF SELLER/LISTING BROKER~~) (~~AGENT OF BUYER AND SELLER~~) **STRIKE THOSE NOT APPLICABLE**
3 **GENERAL PROVISIONS** The Buyer, Juan Maldonado
4 _____, offers to purchase the Property known as [Street Address] 1739 Main St.
5 _____ in the City
6 of Green Bay, County of Brown Wisconsin (insert additional
7 description, if any, at lines 165-172 or 435-442 or attach as an addendum per line 434), on the following terms:
8 ■ **PURCHASE PRICE:** Thirty nine thousand and zero cents
9 _____ Dollars (\$ 39,000.00).
10 ■ **EARNEST MONEY** of \$ _____ accompanies this Offer and earnest money of \$ _____
11 will be mailed, or commercially or personally delivered within _____ days of acceptance to listing broker or
12 _____.
13 ■ **THE BALANCE OF PURCHASE PRICE** will be paid in cash or equivalent at closing unless otherwise provided below.
14 ■ **INCLUDED IN PURCHASE PRICE:** Seller is including in the purchase price the Property, all Fixtures on the Property on
15 the date of this Offer not excluded at lines 17-18, and the following additional items: _____
16 _____
17 ■ **NOT INCLUDED IN PURCHASE PRICE:** _____
18 _____
19 **CAUTION: Identify Fixtures that are on the Property (see lines 185-193) to be excluded by Seller or which are rented**
20 **and will continue to be owned by the lessor.**
21 **NOTE: The terms of this Offer, not the listing contract or marketing materials, determine what items are**
22 **included/excluded.**
23 **ACCEPTANCE** Acceptance occurs when all Buyers and Sellers have signed one copy of the Offer, or separate but identical
24 copies of the Offer.
25 **CAUTION: Deadlines in the Offer are commonly calculated from acceptance. Consider whether short term deadlines**
26 **running from acceptance provide adequate time for both binding acceptance and performance.**
27 **BINDING ACCEPTANCE** This Offer is binding upon both Parties only if a copy of the accepted Offer is delivered to Buyer on
28 or before _____ Seller may keep the Property on the
29 market and accept secondary offers after binding acceptance of this Offer.
30 **CAUTION: This Offer may be withdrawn prior to delivery of the accepted Offer.**
31 **OPTIONAL PROVISIONS** TERMS OF THIS OFFER THAT ARE PRECEDED BY AN OPEN BOX (☐) ARE PART OF THIS
32 OFFER ONLY IF THE BOX IS MARKED SUCH AS WITH AN "X." THEY ARE NOT PART OF THIS OFFER IF MARKED "N/A"
33 OR ARE LEFT BLANK.
34 **DELIVERY OF DOCUMENTS AND WRITTEN NOTICES** Unless otherwise stated in this Offer, delivery of documents and
35 written notices to a Party shall be effective only when accomplished by one of the methods specified at lines 36-54.
36 (1) **Personal Delivery:** giving the document or written notice personally to the Party, or the Party's recipient for delivery if
37 named at line 38 or 39.
38 Seller's recipient for delivery (optional): _____
39 Buyer's recipient for delivery (optional): _____
40 ☐ (2) **Fax:** fax transmission of the document or written notice to the following telephone number:
41 Seller: (_____) Buyer: (_____) _____
42 ☐ (3) **Commercial Delivery:** depositing the document or written notice fees prepaid or charged to an account with a
43 commercial delivery service, addressed either to the Party, or to the Party's recipient for delivery if named at line 38 or 39, for
44 delivery to the Party's delivery address at line 47 or 48.
45 ☐ (4) **U.S. Mail:** depositing the document or written notice postage prepaid in the U.S. Mail, addressed either to the Party,
46 or to the Party's recipient for delivery if named at line 38 or 39, for delivery to the Party's delivery address at line 47 or 48.
47 Delivery address for Seller: _____
48 Delivery address for Buyer: _____
49 ☐ (5) **E-Mail:** electronically transmitting the document or written notice to the Party's e-mail address, if given below at line
50 53 or 54. If this is a consumer transaction where the property being purchased or the sale proceeds are used primarily for
51 personal, family or household purposes, each consumer providing an e-mail address below has first consented electronically
52 to the use of electronic documents, e-mail delivery and electronic signatures in the transaction, as required by federal law.
53 E-Mail address for Seller (optional): _____
54 E-Mail address for Buyer (optional): _____
55 **PERSONAL DELIVERY/ACTUAL RECEIPT** Personal delivery to, or Actual Receipt by, any named Buyer or Seller
56 constitutes personal delivery to, or Actual Receipt by, all Buyers or Sellers.